400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 - Telephone
(516) 742-4366 - Facsimile
email: intrprop@ssmp.com

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER



	Our Docket: 15004Z	,		Please Reply	☐ Please Recycle	
Re:	Alan P. Kozikowski, et al. U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/246,307		CC:			
Phone:			Date:	January 24	January 24, 2005	
Fax:	1-571-273-0965		Pages:	17 (includ	17 (including fax cover sheet)	
То:	United States Patent & Trademark Office		From	From: Mark J. Cohen, Esq.		

CONFIDENTIALITY: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission may contain information which is either confidential or legally privileged and is intended only for the authorized use of the individual or entity named above without right or publication or republication, dissemination or disclosure except as expressly set forth or established by course of dealing. All rights are reserved. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this facsimile is prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to arrange for return of the documents.

If you have any problems concerning this facsimile, please call (516) 742-4343 and ask for Nancy Gilmore.

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA, SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK 11530-3319

ALLEN R. MORGANSTERN WILLIAM C. ROCH STEPHEN A. YOUNG COUNSEL

JOHN F. SCULLY STEPHEN D. MURPHY KENNETH L. KING RETIRED

ANTHONY C. SCOTT (1931-1994) WILLIAM E. MCNULTY (1927-1993)

TELEPHONE: (516) 742-4343 FACSIMILE: (516) 742-4366 E-MAIL: Intprop@ssmp.com

LEOPOLD PRESSER
FRANK S. DIGIGLIO
PAUL J. ESATTO, JR.
JOHN S. SENSNY
MARK J. COHEN
EDWARD W. GROLZ
STEVEN FISCHMAN
PETER I. BERNSTEIN
THOMAS SPINELLJ
ROBERT L. BERNSTEIN
MARVIN BRESSLER
GEORGE BRIEGER
DERMOTT J. COOKE'
RICHARD J. DANYKO
RALPH F. HOPPIN
AASHEESH SHRAWAH
SETH M. WEINFELD
KEITH A. WELTSCH*
XIAOCHUN ZHU

XIAOCHUN ZHI OH BAR ONLY "MD BAR ONLY

YONG LU LESLIE S. SZIVOS, PH.D. DAVID J. TORRENTE PATENT AGENTS

ZHUANG YUAN TECHNICAL CONSULTANT January 24, 2005 VIA FACSIMILE

Mark J. Cohon Lake

Examiner Gupta
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re:

Alan P. Kozikowski, et al.

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/246,307 RCT Project No. 009328-0009

Our Docket: 15004Z

Dear Examiner Gupta:

Pursuant to your request, enclosed herewith is another copy of the Submission For Request of Revival of Application Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.8.

MJC:ng Enclosures

H:\work\1572\15004z\LTR\15004z.L10.doc

Dated: June 30, 2003

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Alan P. Kozikowski, et al. Examiner: Anish Gupta

Art Unit: 1654 Serial No.: 09/246,307

Filed: February 8, 1999 **Docket:** 15004Z

For: CYCLIC DIPEPTIDES AND AZETIDINONE

COMPOUNDS AND THEIR USE IN TREATING CNS INJURY AND NEURODEGENERATIVE

DISORDERS

Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUBMISSION FOR REQUEST OF REVIVAL OF APPLICATION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.8

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.8, applicants respectfully request that the United States Patent and Trademark Office withdraw its Notice of Abandonment improperly issued and revive the above-identified application.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office improperly issued a Notice of Abandonment dated June 18, 2003, alleging that the applicants did not file a proper reply to the Office Action dated January 17, 2001. Applicants respectfully submit that they did timely file a proper reply to the Official Action.

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Dated: June 30, 2003

sumara

فيصوع

It appears that the confusion on this issue is caused by the mistake of the United States Patent and Trademark Office in characterizing the Official Action of January 17, 2001, as a Final Rejection. However, the Official Action dated January 17, 2001 was not a Final Rejection. As evidence thereof attached hereto is a copy of the Office Action dated January 17, 2001 as Exhibit A. A review of the Office Action clearly reveals that it was a non-final Office Action. Consequently, since it was a non-final Office Action, no Notice of Appeal is required to be filed. A complete response thereto just requires a written Response to the issues raised in the Office Action.

In fact, a complete Response thereto accompanied by a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 and a petition for a three-month extension of term and the appropriate Official fees were filed on July 11, 2001. No other documents were filed or needed to be filed in response to the Official Action.

In addition, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed on July 11, 2001.

As evidence that the United States Patent and Trademark Office received the documents, attached hereto as Exhibit B is a copy of the Advisory Action dated April 4, 2002 improperly issued. A review of the third page of the Advisory Action indicates receipt of the Official Response, Declaration and Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

However, it appears that the United States Patent and Trademark Office mistakenly believes that the Official Action of January 17, 2001, was a Final Rejection, which it clearly was not. As a consequence of its belief, it improperly issued an Advisory Action, which

was dated April 4, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B. But, since the Official Action was non-final, no Advisory Action should have been issued in the first instance.1

Shortly after receipt of the Notice of Abandonment, applicants' attorney contacted Examiner Gupta, on June 30, 2003, who advised him that the records in the United States Patent and Trademark Office incorrectly indicate that the Office Action of January 17, 2001 was a Final Rejection. Examiner Gupta advised that applicants should respond to the Notice of Abandonment and advise therein of the mistake in the characterization of the Official Action of January 17, 2001 as a Final Rejection.

Applicants' attorney wishes to thank Examiner Gupta for his helpful suggestions.

Applicants' attorney have followed Examiner Gupta's advice and reiterate that the Official Action of January 17, 2001 was non-final, as clearly shown by Exhibit A. A review thereof clearly shows that there is no indication anywhere on the Official Action that it was a Final Official Action. Thus, the Response dated July 11, 2001, accompanied by the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132, which was timely filed, addressed the issues raised in the Official Action and was a complete Response thereto. Consequently, the United States Patent and Trademark Office have should not have abandoned the above-identified application.

Applicants respectfully request that the records of the United States Patent and Trademark office be corrected to reflect that the Official Action of January 17, 2001 was nonfinal. Moreover, applicants respectfully request that the application be revived for examination. In addition, applicants respectfully request that the Response duly filed on July 11, 2001 be reviewed and considered on the merits. Finally, applicants respectfully request that the

Applicants' attorney contacted Examiner Gupta shortly after the issuance thereof as well as in September and December 2002 and February 2003 to advise him of the error.

Supplemental Information Disclosure filed on July 11, 2001 be made of record in the above-identified application.

A Petition Fee is not expressly required under the controlling provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.8(b). Authorization is given, however, to charge payment of any necessary fees associated with the Communication to Deposit Account No. 19-1013/SSMP. A duplicate copy of this paper is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark J. Cohen

Registration No. 32.21

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser 400 Garden City Plaza Garden City, NY 11530 (516) 742-4343 MJC:lf